| ARSENIC (ATOMIC ABSORPTION, FURNACE TECHNIQUE) EPA 7060A REVISION 1 SEPTEMBER 1994 Page 1 of 2 | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|----------|----------|--|--|--|
| Facility Name: | | | | VELAP ID | | | | |
| Assessor Name:Analyst Name: | | | Inspection Date | | | | | |
| Relevant Aspect of Standards | Method Reference | Y | N | N/A | Comments | | | |
| Records Examined: SOP Number/ Revision/ Date Analyst: | | | | | | | | |
| Sample ID: Date of Sample | Date of Sample Preparation: | | [| | | | | |
| Were sample containers washed prior to use with detergents, acids, and reagent water? | 6.2 | | | | | | | |
| Were aqueous samples acidified to a pH < 2 with nitric acid and refrigerated prior to analysis? (Waste Samples need not be refrigerated.) | 6.4 | | | | | | | |
| Prior to analysis by this method, were sludge sample subjected to preparation by the procedure described in EPA method 3050A? | 2.1 7.1 | | | | | | | |
| Preparation of Aqueous Samples: | | | | | | | | |
| Did aliquots of aqueous samples have 30% H ₂ O ₂ added to them followed by the addition of enough concentrated HNO ₃ to result in an acid concentration of 1% (v/v)? | 7.1.1 | | | | | | | |
| Was the above mixture then heated at 95°C? | 7.1.1 | | | | | | | |
| Were samples then brought back to volume with reagent water? | 7.1.2 | | | | | | | |
| Were aliquots of digestates taken, and did they have nickel nitrate or other appropriate matrix modifier added to them? | 7.1.3 | | | | | | | |
| Quality Control: | | | | | | | | |
| Was a calibration curve prepared each day with a minimum of a calibration blank and three standards? | 7000 A 8.2 | | | | | | | |
| Was an initial calibration standard analyzed to be within 10% of its true value for a curve to be considered valid? | 7000 A 8.2 | | | | | | | |
| Notes/ Comments: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

ARSENIC (ATOMIC ABSORPTION, FURNACE TECHNIQUE) EPA 7060A REVISION 1 SEPTEMBER 1994

Page 2 of 2

| Relevant Aspect of Standards | Method Reference | Υ | N | N/A | Comments |
|--|---------------------|---|---|-----|----------|
| After every 10 samples, was a mid-range check standards analyzed to be within 20% of its true value? | 7000 A 8.3 | | | | |
| Was at least one matrix spike and one matrix spike duplicate included with each analytical batch? | 7000 A 8.4 | | | | |
| If samples had analyte concentrations above 25 times the detection limit, was one typical sample from each analytical batch selected for dilution to determine whether interferences were present? | 7000 A 8.6.1 | | | | |
| If the above undiluted sample and diluted sample did not agree to within 10%, were samples matrix spikes of these samples determined to be between 85 and 115% recovery? | 7000 A 8.6.1 | | | | |
| If all samples in a batch had analyte concentrations less than 10 times the detection limit, were matrix spikes found to be between 85 and 115%? | 7000 A 8.6.2 | | | | |
| If above matrix spikes in above steps did not have recoveries between 85 and 115%, were all samples in the associated batches analyzed with method of standard additions? | 7000 A 8.6.2 | | | | |

| N | otoc | 100 | mm | ents: |
|----|------|--------|---------|-------|
| IN | ores | / (.0 | orrorri | enis |